

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

277 SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314

TELEPHONE: (703) 836-6400

FACSIMILE: (703) 836-2787

E-MAIL: O&B@OLIFF.COM

WWW.OLIFF.COM

January 13, 2004

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

To: Examiner RoDec
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

1-571-273-1388

From: Linda M. Saltiel, Reg. No. 51,122

Your Ref.: Application No. 09/987,413 Our Ref.: 111115

Number of Pages Sent (Including cover sheet): 10

Prepared By: rav

Comments:

Sent by: rav

This facsimile is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above and may contain privileged or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this facsimile is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by facsimile or telephone, and return the facsimile to us by mail at the above address.

PTO RECEIPT FOR FILING OF PAPERS

► Mail Room (Regular Delivery)

The following papers have been filed:

Supplemental Request for Reconsideration with attached executed Rule 132 Declaration

Name of Applicant: Yoshifumi IIDA et al.

Serial No.: 09/987,413

Atty. File No.: 111115

Title (New Cases):

Sender's Initials: JAO:LMS/xav

P-152
45

PATENT OFFICE DATE STAMP



**COPY TO BE STAMPED BY PATENT OFFICE
AND RETURNED BY MESSENGER**

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Yoshifumi IIDA et al.

Group Art Unit: 1753

Application No.: 09/987,413

Examiner: C. RoDee

Filed: November 14, 2001

Docket No.: 111115

For: TONER FOR DEVELOPING AN ELECTROSTATIC LATENT IMAGE,
DEVELOPER, DEVELOPER UNIT, AND METHOD FOR FORMING AN IMAGE

SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

As a supplement to the Request for Reconsideration filed on November 17, 2003,
please further consider the following remarks.

Claims 1-7, 9-15, 18 and 19 are pending herein.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner RoDee in the December 15, 2003 interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

During the interview, the Examiner alleged that the data in the Declaration filed with the December 15, 2003 Request for Reconsideration was unclear, and the Examiner requested additional information. Specifically, the Examiner requested additional information detailing how the evaluation was done for the various toners. Thus, the Examiner requested a supplemental Declaration to clarify the evaluation criteria.

Application No. 09/987,413

To this end, Applicants herewith submit a supplemental Rule 132 Declaration to further clarify the evaluation criteria provided in the Rule 132 Declaration previously filed on November 17, 2003.

The attached Rule 132 Declaration reveals that when used in a single-layer constitution, the white color toner of the present invention and the cyan toner of U.S. Patent No. 4,985,327 (hereinafter "Sakashita") provide almost similar values in shielding property. However, when used in a two-layer constitution in which the white color toner or the cyan toner is superimposed on the black toner layer, the white color toner of the present invention provides excellent results in shielding property (higher transmission density) as compared to the toner of Sakashita.

Nothing in the references cited by the Patent Office in the July 17, 2003 Office Action (i.e., U.S. Patent No. 4,956,258 to Watanabe, U.S. Patent No. 4,855,204 to Fujii, *Handbook of Imaging Materials* to Diamond, pp. 179-181 and 222-224, or U.S. Patent No. 5,994,015 to Vail), alone or in combination, remedies the deficiencies of Sakashita as discussed above. More specifically, nothing in the cited references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the unexpected properties associated with the white toner of the present invention. One of ordinary skill in the art thus would not have found the invention obvious from the teachings of the references cited in the Office Action.


For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Sakashita, Watanabe, Fujii, Diamond and Vail, alone or in combination, would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the invention of claims 1 and 11 or of depending claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12-15, 18 and 19.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7, 9-15, 18 and 19 are earnestly solicited.

Application No. 09/987,413

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/rav

Attachment:
Rule 132 Declaration

Date: January 2, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

